DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 150 272 CE 012 351

AUTHOR Jelinek, Mariann
TITLE Career Management and Women.
PUB DATE 3 Jun 77
NOTE 21p.; Paper presented at the Annual Conference of the International Communication Association (27th, Berlin, Germany, June 3, 1977)

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 HC-$1.67 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Behavior Patterns; *Employment Patterns; Equal Opportunities (Jobs); Family Background; *Females; Individual Characteristics; *Management; Management Development; Management Education; Research Methodology; *Research Needs; Research Problems; Role Conflict; Role Models; Role Perception; Sex Discrimination; Sex Role; *Sex Stereotypes; Trend Analysis; *Vocational Development; Working Women

ABSTRACT

Until recently, research on management and careers typically examined white, middle-class male subjects. Patterns, norms, and career problems brought to light by this research are not necessarily applicable to wider populations. When studies on women did appear, at first they were typically more polemical than scientific; they sought to prove discrimination. More recent research takes a broader more useful view of the underlying mechanisms of career management. Attention to multiple roles and sequential careers has suggested a far more complex and sophisticated view of careers, as well as valuable insights applicable to both sexes. More research and more information are needed to flesh out the new conceptual models being formed, in particular, more investigations of role-conflict in men; more thoughtful considerations of nontraditional career patterns--which may be more common than uncommon; and continued careful re-examination of stereotypes and assumptions in explaining adult career paths. The outcome of such research will undoubtedly be much better managers at all levels, for both male and female, and better use of the scarcest resource of competent human beings. (Author/TA)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED150272

CAREER MANAGEMENT AND WOMEN

by

Mariann Jelinek, Ph.D.
The Amos Tuck School
Dartmouth College

A paper presented at the
27th Annual Conference of
The International Communication Association

Berlin, June 3, 1977

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Mariann Jelinek
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC) AND THE ERIC SYSTEM CONTRACTORS."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

CE 012 351

ABSTRACT

Until quite recently, research on management and careers typically examined white, middle-class male subjects. Patterns, norms and career problems brought to light by this research are not necessarily applicable to wider populations. When studies on women did appear, at first they were typically more polemical than scientific. They sought to prove discrimination.

More recent research takes a broader, more useful view of the underlying mechanisms. Attention to multiple roles and sequential careers has suggested a far more complex and sophisticated view of careers, as well as valuable insights applicable to both sexes.

CAREER MANAGEMENT AND WOMEN

by

Mariann Jelinek, PhD
The Amos Tuck School
Dartmouth College

Introduction:

In October, 1969, Elizabeth Janeway began a review by noting,

> Half the human race is female. It is sometimes difficult to remember this, even for a female: and never more difficult than when reading history. Until late yesterday afternoon (speaking in terms of historical time) women intruded so rarely on the course of events that their total omission would hardly be noticeable.

We might adopt these comments almost without change, if we substitute the words "management studies" or "professional career studies" for "history," with no loss in meaning. The reasons are not far to seek. In management, as in history, our focus has traditionally been on those who lead, decide, strategize, use power. Typically, this has meant men. It still does. The overwhelming majority of large business firms in the United States are still managed by men - even today, in 1977, some 13 years after the passage of Equal Economic Opportunity legislation, some six or seven years after the onset of lawsuits pressuring for change. Of 3.2 million people listed in the 1970 census as "managers and administrators" earning $10,000 or more a year, only 4.8 per cent were women. A Fortune magazine study on 1,220 major corporations and 6,500 top executives earning above $30,000 yielded only 11 women.[1] Most women are primarily concentrated in entry-level, supervisory, or trainee

OE 012 351

positions. The Wall Street Journal estimates that women hold only 6% of all middle-management posts, and only 1% of positions at vice presidential or higher levels.[2] By another popular measure of success, salary, professional women also fall far behind their male colleagues: only some 1% of working women make over $10,000 per year, in comparison with 13% of working men. A female college graduate is more likely to be underemployed, and may well earn less than a male high school graduate.[3] A recent survey of members of the Academy of Management, mirroring findings for other academic disciplines, noted that female respondents lagged their male counterparts of the same age substantially in salary.[4]

A Shift in Focus:

But while women have not yet captured the bastions of power in the academic business community, or in the business community at large, changes are occurring. There are more women in managerial positions, even if at entry level; there are more women on corporate boards of directors; and there are many more female applicants for professional degrees including the MBA. The New York Times[5] says that women presently constitute about a third of law school graduates, and an increasing proportion of top-flight business school graduates. According to a recent survey, in 1975-76, some 207 women appeared on 237 corporate boards: 80 of these appointments were made in 1975.[6] Business Week estimated 400 women on corporate boards in 1976, and described them as"exceptionally able people" who made their professional mark when women had to be outstanding merely to survive.[7] Women used to be appointed to

boards to represent "the woman's point of view." That day is passing - today's women directors may protest that role. Not long ago, most would have felt obliged to champion women's causes without question. Now, it's permissible to disagree, to examine the assumptions, or to pay attention to other things entirely.

A similar broadening of perspective is visible is writing on women. The first generation of "women's studies" was political and polemical. Authors sought to prove discrimination and assert women's rights. Consciousness raising had a place, especially when a major aspect of the problem was the seeming invisibility of women as managers in the business world or as research topics. But it also had costs: polemic and consciousness raising polarize positions and impede free communication by arousing feelings of threat.

At least one sociologist, Nathan Glazer,[8] claims that our entire approach to affirmative action is dysfunctional, because EEO records-keeping requirements in essence treat people as group members - women, blacks, Spanish surname - rather than as individuals. The consequences, he claims, are a growing divisiveness and increasingly discriminatory attitudes as we get used to thinking of one another as group representatives. While Glazer focuses on blacks in his books, many similar questions might be raised about EEO as it applies to women. A major problem - both for women and for minority group members - is that at present there is little rigrous empirical work to base conclusions on: we just don't know. And we won't, until we have more sophisticated research that tests some of these assumptions, and more sophisticated models

that have conceptual room for alternative explanations.

Perhaps the strongest inference to be drawn from an examination of research on women and careers is of the need for a thorough re-thinking of most of our concepts and theories and paradigms - about women, about careers, about work and its meaning for adults. This means going well past polemic.

The Need for New Models:

More recent studies are far more sophisticated. The conceptual models employed are vastly expanded in that they no longer seek to prove discrimination, but rather to explicate observed differences by unearthing the underlying mechanisms. The shift is of the utmost importance. As a recent study on "Women and the Academic Labor Market"[9] noted,

> To summarize the direct discrimination discussion, what is often argued as per se evidence of discrimination can be interpreted as reflecting differences in life-cycle accumulation of professional skills. To resolve this question, it would be necessary to examine the earnings patterns of women who do work full time throughout their careers and should therefore have comparable levels of acquired skill.

This study concluded that "the potential role of direct discrimination against women is much smaller than is suggested by the wage differential unadjusted for detailed work history"(p.213). In contrast, Mary Townsend Hamilton[10] concluded that wage discrimination does have a sex dimension, and that the estimated sex differentials generally exceeded those related to color, often by considerable amounts. Her study concerned non-professional white- and blue-collar workers.

Still another recent study focuses directly on mangement.

Margaret Hennig and Anne Jardim[11] reported on an on-going study that has so far surveyed some 3000 women and 1000 men who have responded to a questionnaire assessing attitudes, expectations, career plans, experiences, and backgrounds. Hennig and Jardim conclude that women do indeed differ from men - and that a major source of difference has been dysfunctional attitudes and expectations held by women about their work, their careers, and their colleagues. They offer constructive advice for women seeking successful management careers. The conceptual framework on which the research is based is quite apparently not "let's prove discrimination," but rather "let's explore attitudes, backgrounds, and expectations for the light they might cast upon differences in careers." Like Johnson and Stafford, and Hamilton, Hennig and Jardim seek to go beyond the notion of "discrimination" as a single, monolithic explanation of differences between male and female career experiences. In so doing, they employ a conceptual framework not bounded by polemic bias. Such frameworks include the means of testing for alternative, less obvious, and far more useful explanations than "discrimination." In the process, all these studies pose critical questions of the assumptions that all differentials are due to deliberate discrimination that can be legislated out of existence, and the stereotypic assumptions about the experience of women that purport to explain all differences. These studies go well past polemic in shaping more inclusive, muscular models. They are, I believe, indicative of a new direction in research on women.

Attitudes and Change: Emerging Similarities:

A similar shift in the attitudes of women in management roles seems also in evidence. Just as writing on women has moved well past the defnesive stance of seeking to explain all differences as "discrimination," many women in management positions now treat "discrimination" as one of a series of problems they face as managers - of no overriding emotional importance, merely one facet of reality to be dealt with. A study by Litterer[12] notes that, while all members of his "successful women manager" category reported encountering sex discrimination upon entering managerial work, "all looked at the matter as a problem that could be solved or at least handled satisfactorily for their purposes." In contrast, women in a larger sample who did not meet criteria for the "successful" sample held another view:

> For some of these, problems so embitter their lives that this seriously interferes with their professional, and often personal lives. Others took up the cause of righting this injustice and made it the paramount focus of their careers. Still others became so dispirited that they came to doubt their own competency, [and] they either just stagnated in one position, or quit.

An on-going study of graduates of the Harvard Business School by Harlan and Jelinek[13] found similar evidence. Most women mentioned descrimination, but the majority saw it as one problem among many in establishing a successful career - not the only problem, or even the most important. One woman in their sample recounted her relief at finding that her consulting colleagues held stereotypic views of her career expectations: "It was simple ignorance on their part, not malice; they honestly didn't realize

that I might be interested in a promotion to a job requiring substantial travel!" Still others told of strategies - ranging from "super-competence" to direct confrontation over beers to humor to persistence - which they used to overcome discrimination when encountered.

Some fascinating differences between women and men did emerge in the Harlan-Jelinek study. To a much larger degree, women tended to be the children of highly educated parents. Their mothers typically worked, most often in business or education: 40% of the women reported mothers who worked, while only 29% of the men did in a subsample matched for age, year of graduation, and job experience prior to HBS. Some 21% of the women reported that their mothers held graduate degrees (31% that their mothers had at least "some graduate or professional school"). In contrast, only 6% of the men reported mothers' graduate degrees (13% of the mothers had "some" graduate education). All this suggests that strong maternal role models are quite important for the women who choose to undertake an MBA at Harvard - with its reputation for challenge, pressure, overload, and its monetary and advancement value. Clearly, for these women, both parents tended to provide reinforcement and emphasis on <u>serious</u> education, and on education as an appropriate arena for competition and accomplishment for their daughters.

Another fascinating difference concerns marriage. While 60% of the subsample women are married, 81% of the men are married. Of those women who are married, many have no children, although they frequently comment that they plan children "eventually." Members of the sample tend to marry after HBS (somewhat later,

for the women, than national norms). Spouse's occupation highlights another difference between the men and women: men are most frequently married to housewives, who may have a college degree but rarely more. The women are typically married to men who are professionals or businessmen with graduate degrees; as one might expect, many of the women are married to HBS grads. The women appear to value education highly in choice of mates.

A more arresting trend visible in the Harlan-Jelinek data concerns changes taking place over time, rather than sex-related differences. Substantial numbers of respondents in the Harlan and Jelinek study, both male and female, reported concerns with "career direction" or "career progress." These concerns highlight an underlying similarity far greater than apparent differences. Other similarities emerge as well. The early "occupational segregation" of women in "women's jobs" is beginning to break down - for female graduates of the Harvard Business School at least. More women report direct managerial line responsibility - in manufacturing, for instance. One route to the top - through line responsibility - has traditionally been more direct.[14] For both sexes, job-related problems centered on learning to do the job, and on coping with interpersonal difficulties (although women more frequently described the problem as "getting through the system"). Amidst these similarities one substantial change does stand out over time (ranging from the class of 1962 to the class of 1975): there was an increasing concern with "non-traditional" issues. For both sexes, balancing the demands of a professional career against personal

needs and family life was a major concern. The most apparent conclusion to be drawn from these data is that older respondents are more alike than different, regardless of sex; and younger respondents are more alike, regardless of sex. The younger males are more like the younger females than either group is like their older same-sex predecessors. In a subsample split by year of graduation (half the sample graduating before 1969, half after), older graduates typically seemed to have a more stereotypic separation of responsibilities toward home and children (where there were children), with women spending more time than men. However, the younger sample spent typically more time with family than the older sample - regardless of sex. Of course, this might partially be explained by the age of children, for younger children require more attention. But both parents in this sample seem to be spending more time. Here again, the younger graduates are more alike, regardless of sex, than either sex is like its same-sex predecessors.

Women as a group seem less successful than the men: they rank below their male colleagues on salary (82% of the women in the sample had salaries of less than $3000 per month in the total sample, while only 51% of the men fell into this category). As to level of hierarchy, 69% of the men were at upper to top levels of management, while only 37% of the total sample women were. The differences are larger for the older graduates than for the younger, as might be expected in light of continuing recent pressure towards greater equality on the job.

Toward More Complex Models:

These findings highlight a critical problem for women and minority group members, and for the social sciences taken as a group. Though stereotypes abound, providing "explanations", there is at present relatively little empirical work relating to women and minority group members in management upon which to base conclusions - much of what has been done to date has failed to transcend the biases of current cultural stereotypes. We won't have answers to key questions about the possibly differing experiences of men and women, or whites and others, until we have more sophisticated research - with conceptual frameworks that have room for similarities as well as differences, and explanations more complex than simple "discrimination." The difficulty is that a great many of our theories, concepts and paradigms - about people and their work, about careers and career patterns and choices, about the meaning of work for adults - are drawn from research on male, middle-class, white Americans.[15] Just as most executives, even today, are white, male and middle-class, so most existing research on management has been based on this sample. Consequently most of our present theory is based on limited data. Utilizing these concepts for women and minority group members is, at best problematical - especially as a growing body of research suggests that attitudes may be more distinctive across an age or experience spectrum than across sex. This is true even for such seemingly sex-free concepts as identity, self-esteem, involvement in work, vocational maturity, occupational choice, and career path. Although Blau et al.[16] noted as long ago as 1956 that occupational or career

choice was not made once and for all at adolescence, the obsolete model is still with us, only beginning to fade after 20 years. Women's work experience is a factor in its demise.

Many women - if not most - have multiple careers, as workers, wives, and mothers. If the choice was either career or family, it is most frequently now a choice of timing. Most women work; and most working women are married, with husband present. The sheer increase in female participation in the workforce has motivated a search for better models that can explain women's experience as well as men's. A number of stereotypes are falling in the process. Thus, in 1928 Hogg might assert that women work for convenience, as a "stop-gap" before marriage - when, presumably, they left the workforce for good. If women ever typically married and left work permanently, however, that does not presently seem to be the case. In 1974, some 35 million women worked, constituting 45% of all women over 16 years of age and over, and 39% of the labor force as a whole.[17] Even the woman who does marry and stay home to raise children will typically find herself re-entering the labor force at about 40, with some 25 years of work-life ahead of her. Unless our paradigms have conceptual space for women as serious, long-term members of the workforce, our models are incomplete. Unless our models of career choice are complex enough to encompass multiple sequential or simultaneous involvements - like parenthood and professional life - they are insufficient. And not only on account of women. A study by the US Labor Department, based on 1970 census data, noted that nearly one in three American workers

gave up their jobs and "changed careers" in the five-year period 1965-1970.[18] Fortune[19] corroborated the Harlan-Jelinek survey finding that personal life was increasingly important to men as well as women. In accounting for his company's corporate headquarters move away from New York, General Telephone and Electronics chairman Leslie H. Warner cited the increasing primacy of managers' personal lives:

> A much more important reason for the move was the growing difficulty we were having getting bright young people in our subsidiaries to accept promotions that required them to transfer to our headquarters in Manhattan. In some cases we offered to double their salaries, in one case from $30,000 to $60,000, but we still got turned down. The money, the promotion - it wasn't enough to lure them.
>
> Mind you, I admire these young executives for refusing transfers because they think it would hurt their private lives. We never did that in my day. I wish we had.

This sounds much more like the stereotypic expectations of women in the workforce - although Litterer's sample of successful women would all move and work things out with their husbands, if a move was required. In short, our stereotypes may well be misleading, and our concepts of career involvement and identity must include substantial room for variances - variety may be more the rule than the old stereotypes.

The experience of women at work hitherto has been demonstrably difference from that of men. This different experience, besides demanding expanded conceptual models, may indeed generate alternative insights applicable to the work experience of males as well. Women typically have multiple careers, as workers, wives, and mothers. Each of these careers imposes substantial demands which may well

conflict with the demands of another role. Of the women in the Harlan-Jelinek study, 60% were married, and typically reported spending 20 hours a week on household and family tasks. Few men reported so heavy an involvement in home activities, yet a growing body of evidence suggests a long-term trend toward equality in parenting demands and household responsibilities, particularly in the growing number of dual-career families.[20] Some investigations of women's role conflicts and coping strategies in dealing with the multiple demanding roles of wife, mother, and worker; little research exists on the impact of this type of conflict for men. These trends suggest that more research is needed.

Research on women's role conflicts has given new prominence to the non-work aspects of adult life, and to multiple or sequential career patterns. Attention to women's careers has coincided with increased interest in developing all human potential. As a result, career options are expanding for both women and men, with increasing divergence from the old model of irrevocable, linear career choice. Whether or not a man decides to become a "househusband," staying home to take care of children and household as his primary career, his choices and involvement with family and non-work facets have both been significantly expanded. The female pattern of sequential careers (work following time out for childbearing) is mirrored in the "retread" phenomenon, where people go back to school, perhaps for substantial training, or undertake a very different second career after lengthy involvement in a first. It had always been done, of course; but now it's perhaps more common. Certainly much more attention is being paid to the whole idea now.

Besides expanded career options, investigations of women's experience suggest how people cope with conflicting demands. This kind of research would seem particularly fruitful for managers, whose overload situation is endemic. Women who successfully manage their multiple roles may well provide some hypotheses to be tested in the world of managerial work. Hall[21] identified structural role redefinition, in which the demands of the situation are restructured, as by negotiation with a superior, as the most effective strategy employed by women to cope with role conflict. The structural role redefinition strategy identified by Hall involves a proactive, self-defining approach. This is an apt description of the response of the G.T.E. executives, cited earlier, who redefine their response to exclude automatic acceptance of promotions that entail heavy personal costs. A priori, such a response would seem to offer the greatest likelihood of resolving conflicting role demands, as well as the greatest amount of personal autonomy. Both would appear to be powerful motivators for the entrepreneurial, enterprising, initiating personality types most frequently identified among managers.

The woman manager's situation suggests some other directions for research and some other gaps in our understanding. EEO demands substantial numbers of female and minority group managers, and also building new responses into our organizations in response to changed policy directives. Murray[22] notes that there was no discernible difference in the public statements and official policies of those companies who <u>did</u> implement EEO directives from those who <u>did not</u>. However, in those that did not,

lower-level managers were convinced that what the top wanted was really the same old thing. Clearly, this suggests an abundant need for research in institutionalizing change, no less than a need for more data on the factors that do make for a successful career path. We need to know a good deal more about identifying, training, and nurturing successful managers. And here, too, the changing trend in research on women may offer some insights. The shift in focus, from proving discrimination to investigation of causes underlying observed differences, has lead to increasing attention to success factors. But research here is only beginning; much remains to be done. The outcome of such research will undoubtedly be much better management of managers at all levels, both male and female, better use of the scarcest resource of competent human beings.

Conclusions:

Research on women at work, and particularly on women as managers, is at once in its infancy and in transition. The time for polemic is past, and new conceptual models are being forged. More research and more information are needed to flesh out these models. In particular, we need:

1. More investigations of role-conflict in men;
2. More thoughtful considerations of "non-traditional" career patterns - which well may be more common than uncommon;
3. Continued careful re-examination of our stereotypes and assumptions in explaining adult career paths.

The implications are far-reaching, and by no means limited to women. Many of our paradigms and concepts about work, management,

leadership and a host of other managerial topics are drawn from limited samples, chiefly of male, middle-class, white Americans. And many of the norms and expectations we bring to research were shaped in drastically different social situations from those we face today. Thus a great many of our tools for investigation - those same paradigms and concepts - must be rethought and recast to include the very different experiences of women, the very different attitudes and expectations of a great many managers - male and female - that seem to be emerging. Perhaps the largest single factor to be taken into account is the increasing participation of women in the workforce, as managers, and as wielders of power. Drastic shifts in the number of women directors mentioned here are only a small corner of the picture.

The re-thinking of so many concepts is difficult especially because the underlying task is to frame new models that question the very assumptions upon which our present concepts rest. We need all the openness we can derive from the less defensive, less contentious approach to women's research, to get past the seductively attractive conclusions suggested by polemic. And we need all the creative theory building we can bring to bear, to enrich our range of possible explanations. If our re-thinking is well done, we will more easily bring social policy into reality.

Footnotes

[1]"The Subordinate Sex," an essay review of William L. O'Neill's Everyone Was Brave: The Rise and Fall of Feminism in America. By Elizabeth Janeway, in The Saturday Review, October 11, 1969.

[2]Wall Street Journal, Tuesday, April 26, 1977.

[3]U.S. Dept. of Labor, Underutilization of Women Workers (Women's Bureau, Workplace Standards Administration, 1972), p. 17. "The educational backgrounds of a great many women are not being fully utilized in their jobs. A startling 7 per cent of employed women who had completed 5 or more years of college were working as service workers (including private household), operatives, sales workers, or clerical workers in March of 1969. Nearly one-fifth of employed women with 4 years of college were working in these occupations, as were some two-thirds of those who had completed 1 to 3 years of college."

[4]Bette Stead and Terry Wayne Mullins, "The Professional Status of Male and Female Academy of Management Members." Preliminary typescript of a paper to be presented at the 37th Annual National Meeting of the Academy of Management, 1977.

[5]New York Times, Sunday, May 1, 1977. Business and Finance.

[6]"Who Are the Women in the Board Rooms?", Business and Society Review (Winter, 1975-76), No. 16. Thirty-three of these women are noted as having a family affiliation with their companies.

[7]Business Week, January 10, 1977.

[8]Nathan Glazer, Affirmative Discrimination. Basic Books, New York: 1976.

[9]Johnson, George E. and Stafford, Frank P., "Women and the Academic Labor Market," in Sex, Discrimination, and the Division of Labor, ed. Cynthia B. Lloyd (Columbia University Press, NY: 1975).

[10]Hamilton, Mary Townsend, "Sex and Income Inequality Among the Employed," Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Sciences (405-410), 1973, pp. 42-52.

[11]Hennig, Margaret and Jardim, Anne, Managerial Women (Doubleday, NY: 1976, 1977). See also Psychology Today, Janaury 1977; and The New York Times (Business and Finance Section, p. 4), Sunday, May 1, 1977.

[12]Litterer, Joseph A., "Life Changes of Successful Women Managers," Paper presented at the 1976 National Meetings of the Academy of Management, Kansas City, Mo.

[13]Harlan, Anne, and Jelinek, Mariann, Career Development Project. Work in progress. Data from interview transcripts, field notes, and preliminary data analysis.

[14]Schein, Edar H., "The Individual, the Organization and the Career: A Conceptual Scheme," Journal of Applied Behavioral Science, 1971, 7 (401-426).

[15]Osipow, Samuel H., "The Relevance of Theories of Career Development Applied to Special Groups: Problems, Needed Data, and Implications," in Picou, S. and Campbell, R.E., eds., The Career Behavior of Special Groups, (Columbus, Ohio: Charles Merrill, 1975).

[16]Blau, Peter M., Gustad, John W., Jesser, Richard, Parnes, Herbert S., and Wilcox, Richard C., "Occupational Choices: A Conceptual Framework," Industrial and Labor Relations Review, 9 (1956).

[17]U.S. Department of Labor, "Highlights of Women's Employment and Education," Employment Standards Administration, Women's Bureau, Washington, D.C., June, 1974.

[18]Sommers, Dixie and Eck, Alan, "Occupational Mobility in the American Labor Force," Monthly Labor Review, January 1977 (3-19).

[19]Fortune, "Why Corporations Are on the Move," May, 1976.

[20]Rappaport, and Rappaport, The Dual Career Family. See also a front-page article in the National Observer of January 1, 1977, "They Manage Both Careers and Kids."

[21]Hall, Douglas T., "A Model of Coping with Role Conflict: The Role Behavior of College Educated Women," ASQ 17, 4 (December, 1972), 471-486.

[22]Murray, Edwin A., "The Social Response Process in Commercial Banks: An Empirical Investigation," The Academy of Management Review 1:3 (July, 1976). See also Murray's unpublished doctoral dissertation, "The Implementation of Social Policies in Commercial Banks," Graduate School of Business, Harvard University, 1974.